

January 19, 1976

CLERK: 11 ayes, 24 nays on motion to advance.

PRESIDENT: The bill fails to advance.

We have, in the South balcony, 85 students from Butler County, Aquinas High School in David City. We're very happy to have all you students here. Hope you enjoy your stay in Nebraska's capital. Thank you for coming.

CLERK: Mr. President, there will be inserted in the Legislative Journal an Attorney General's opinion addressed to Senator Burrows regarding the constitutionality of LB 586. There will also be inserted in the Journal an opinion by Senator ... by the Attorney General addressed to Senator Leslie Stull, which will be inserted in the Journal.

Mr. President, we have some new bills. Read title to LB 817, 818, 819, 820, 821, 822, 823, 824, 825, 826, 827, and 828.

PRESIDENT: We now go to General File. Take up, specifically, LB 445 and LB 713.

CLERK: Read title to LB 445. The bill was first considered on January 13th at which time it was laid over till today ... until the 14th. Apparently, we didn't get to it at that time. Mr. President, there are Committee amendments by Senator Fowler's Urban Affairs Committee.

PRESIDENT: Senator Fowler.

SENATOR FOWLER: I'd move for the adoption of the Committee amendment. LB 445 was brought in by the City of Lincoln and supported by the League of Municipalities. It deals with our current statutes with regard to community development.

The bill does two things. The Committee amendment was to eliminate one of the things. The bill, after the Committee amendments are adopted, all the bill would do would be to write in the state statute that local governments have the authority to implement the Federal Community Development Act. This Act was passed by Congress about two years ago. I think most of us are aware, in our communities, of various projects that are being undertaken under this Act. All this does would be to provide enabling legislation to implement the Community Development Act.

The second thing the bill did, and the thing the Committee felt was too major a change to allow, was it would have allowed communities to issue bonds without a vote of the citizens for community development activities, basically, to finance urban renewal projects without having ... and issue general obligation bonds for those urban renewal projects without getting a vote of the citizens in the community.

It was the Committee's feeling that the Legislature has taken a long standing position that before a city could issue general obligation bonds for projects such as that it would have to have a vote of the people. Therefore,